



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/925,343	08/09/2001	Gerd Jakob Ernst Scheller	CH 000016	4400
65913	7590	03/18/2008	EXAMINER	
NXP, B.V. NXP INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT M/S41-SJ 1109 MCKAY DRIVE SAN JOSE, CA 95131			ELAHEE, MD S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2614	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/18/2008	ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ip.department.us@nxp.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/925,343	<b>Applicant(s)</b> SCHELLER ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> MD S. ELAHEE	<b>Art Unit</b> 2614	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 December 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)             | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

1. This action is responsive to an amendment filed on 12/07/2007. Claims 1 and 3-7 are pending. Claim 2 has been previously cancelled.

### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments filed on 12/07/2007 Remarks have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding claims 1, 6 and 7, the applicant argues on page 4 that the cited portions of the Nakamura reference do not teach that lid 3 in any way functions as a lever element being arranged to bend any material. This argument is not relevant. It is because, examiner did not rely upon Nakamura to teach this limitation. Examiner depends upon Donnelly to teach this limitation.

The applicant further argues on page 4 that Donnelly's belt clip 60 is not part of the housing of a mobile device. This argument is not relevant. It is because, examiner did not rely upon Donnelly to teach this limitation. Examiner depends upon Donnelly to teach the belt clip [i.e., lever element] being arranged to bend a material of lower hardness, external to the personal communications device [i.e., portable electronic apparatus] (col.3, lines 26-31), by way of a leverage effect, wherein the material of lower hardness includes a bottle cap (fig.1-10; col.5, lines 12-18, 44-67, col.6, lines 1-22, 58-67).

Regarding claim 5, the applicant argues on pages 4-5 that the cited portions of the Nakamura reference do not teach that lid 3 is a folded metal plate. This argument is not relevant. It is because, examiner did not rely upon Nakamura to teach this limitation. Examiner depends upon Nakamura to teach that lid 3 can be constructed as an angled metal plate. In other word, lid 3 of Nakamura can be constructed similar to an angled plate.

Therefore, the rejection of the claim in view of Nakamura and Donnely will remain.

### ***Objections to Specification***

3. The disclosure of the specification filed on 08/09/2001 is objected to because of the following informalities: the specification does not have the preferred layout. The following guidelines illustrate the preferred layout for the specification of a utility application. These guidelines are suggested for the applicant's use.

### **Arrangement of the Specification**

As provided in 37 CFR 1.77(b), the specification of a utility application should include the following sections in order. Each of the lettered items should appear in upper case, without underlining or bold type, as a section heading. If no text follows the section heading, the phrase "Not Applicable" should follow the section heading:

- (a) TITLE OF THE INVENTION.
- (b) CROSS-REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS.
- (c) STATEMENT REGARDING FEDERALLY SPONSORED RESEARCH OR DEVELOPMENT.
- (d) THE NAMES OF THE PARTIES TO A JOINT RESEARCH AGREEMENT
- (e) INCORPORATION-BY-REFERENCE OF MATERIAL SUBMITTED ON A COMPACT DISC (See 37 CFR 1.52(e)(5) and MPEP 608.05. Computer program listings (37 CFR 1.96(c)), "Sequence Listings" (37 CFR 1.821(c)), and tables having more than 50 pages of text are permitted to be submitted on compact discs.) or

Art Unit: 2614

REFERENCE TO A "MICROFICHE APPENDIX" (See MPEP § 608.05(a).

"Microfiche Appendices" were accepted by the Office until March 1, 2001.)

(f) BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION.

(1) Field of the Invention.

(2) Description of Related Art including information disclosed under 37 CFR 1.97 and 1.98.

(g) BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION.

(h) BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE SEVERAL VIEWS OF THE DRAWING(S).

(i) DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION.

(j) CLAIM OR CLAIMS (commencing on a separate sheet).

(k) ABSTRACT OF THE DISCLOSURE (commencing on a separate sheet).

(l) SEQUENCE LISTING (See MPEP § 2424 and 37 CFR 1.821-1.825. A "Sequence Listing" is required on paper if the application discloses a nucleotide or amino acid sequence as defined in 37 CFR 1.821(a) and if the required "Sequence Listing" is not submitted as an electronic document on compact disc).

Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 6, the phrase "said lever e" in line 4 is indefinite. It appears that the phrase "said lever e" should be "said lever element being arranged to bend a material of lower hardness, external to the mobile telephone, by way of a leverage effect, wherein the material of lower hardness includes a bottle cap.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

8. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

9. Claims 1 and 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Nakamura** et al. (U.S. 6,529,714) and in view of **Donnelly** (U.S. 5,531,365).

Regarding claims 1 and 6, **Nakamura** teaches a radio communication equipment [i.e., portable electronic mobile phone apparatus] whose housing is provided with a housing part that is constructed as a lid [i.e., lever element], which is integrally arranged in a wall of the housing and is arranged to cover at least partly a battery pack (abstract; fig.1, 2; col.2, lines 54-65).

However, **Nakamura** does not specifically teach the lever element being arranged to bend a material of lower hardness, external to the portable electronic apparatus, by way of a leverage effect, wherein the material of lower hardness includes a bottle cap. **Donnelly** teaches the belt clip [i.e., lever element] being arranged to bend a material of lower hardness, external to the portable electronic apparatus, by way of a leverage effect, wherein the material of lower hardness includes a bottle cap (fig.1-10; col.5, lines 12-18, 44-67, col.6, lines 1-22, 58-67). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify **Nakamura** to incorporate the lever element being arranged to bend a material of lower hardness, external to the portable electronic apparatus, by way of a leverage effect, wherein the material of lower hardness includes a bottle cap in **Nakamura's** invention as taught by **Donnelly**. The motivation for the modification is to do so in order to provide a lever element incorporating a bottle cap opener such that a user can enjoy the benefit of using the lever element for multipurpose use.

Regarding claim 5, **Nakamura** teaches that the lever element is constructed as an angled metal plate so as to cover a battery pack (fig.1; col.2, lines 54-65).

Claim 7 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1. Furthermore, **Nakamura** teaches a lid [i.e., lever element] which offers inherently protection against shocks and pressure and also protects the accumulator (abstract; fig.1, 2; col.1, line 66, col.2, line 7, col.2, lines 54-65, col.3, lines 23-29, 48-54).

10. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Nakamura** et al. in view of **Donnelly** further in view of **Fuchs** et al. (U.S. 3,870,184).

Regarding claim 3, **Nakamura** teaches the lever element is arranged to inherently open battery storage recess [i.e., closures] and is connected to the housing (fig.1, 2; col.2, lines 54-65, col.4, lines 19-24, 32-39).

However, **Nakamura** in view of **Donnelly** fails to teach metal closures. Fuchs teaches metal closures (abstract; col.1, lines 60, 61). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify **Nakamura** in view of **Donnelly** to allow metal closures as taught by **Fuchs**. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to increase the hoop strength.

11. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Nakamura** et al. in view of **Donnelly** further in view of **Savovic** et al. (U.S. 5,260,146).

Regarding claim 4, **Nakamura** in view of **Donnelly** fails to teach that the lever element is made of metal and/or ceramic. **Savovic** teaches that the lid [i.e., lever element] is made of metal



Art Unit: 2614

and/or ceramic (col.3, line 8). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify **Nakamura** in view of **Donnelly** to allow the lever element being made of metal and/or ceramic as taught by **Savovic**. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to connect the anode to the positive terminal.

### ***Conclusion***

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Silverbrook et al. (US 6,405,055) teach Hand held mobile phone with integral internal printer with print media supply.

13. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2614

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MD S. ELAHEE whose telephone number is (571)272-7536.

The examiner can normally be reached on Mon to Fri from 9:00am to 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan Tsang can be reached on (571) 272-7547. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/M. E./

MD SHAFIUL ALAM ELAHEE

Examiner

Art Unit 2614

/Fan Tsang/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2614

March 14, 2008